

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

MONIKA RADFORD,  
*Plaintiff/Appellee,*

*v.*

EVAN RADFORD,  
*Defendant/Appellant.*

No. 2 CA-CV 2019-0062  
Filed November 4, 2019

---

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
*See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(a)(1), (f).*

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County  
No. DV20190421  
The Honorable Cathleen Linn, Judge Pro Tempore

**AFFIRMED**

---

Evan Radford, Tucson  
*In Propria Persona*

RADFORD v. RADFORD  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Brearcliffe authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Staring and Chief Judge Vásquez concurred.

---

BREARCLIFFE, Judge:

¶1 Evan Radford appeals from the March 2019 order of protection issued by the trial court to Radford’s former wife, Monika Radford. We affirm.

**Factual and Procedural Background**

¶2 We view the facts in the light most favorable to upholding the trial court’s order. *Cullum v. Cullum*, 215 Ariz. 352, ¶ 9 (App. 2007). In March 2019, Monika filed a petition for an order of protection. On March 8, 2019, the court granted the petition after an ex parte hearing. A minute entry order reflects that a contested hearing was then held on March 21, 2019. The order also reflects that the court provided Evan notice of the hearing yet he failed to appear and failed to provide the court with any reason for his absence. The order states that the court questioned Monika and affirmed the order of protection.

**Analysis**

¶3 To the extent we understand his appeal, Evan challenges the accuracy of Monika’s testimony supporting her request for the order of protection.<sup>1</sup> Evan further claims that leaving the order of protection in place would be “highly detrimental to the healing process.” However, Evan has failed to comply with the Arizona Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure to such an extent that he has waived his arguments.

¶4 An opening brief must contain an argument with “[a]ppellant’s contentions concerning each issue presented for review, with supporting reasons for each contention, and with citations of legal

---

<sup>1</sup>No transcript of the contested hearing was provided and therefore we do not have before us a record of that evidence. Because Evan provides no transcript, we must presume that the record supports the trial court’s ruling. See *Varco, Inc. v. UNS Elec., Inc.*, 242 Ariz. 166, ¶ 3 (App. 2017) (presuming “missing transcript would support the [trial] court’s ruling”).

RADFORD v. RADFORD  
Decision of the Court

authorities and appropriate references to the portions of the record on which the appellant relies.” Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 13(a)(7)(A). “We generally decline to address issues that are not argued adequately, with appropriate citation to supporting authority.” *In re J.U.*, 241 Ariz. 156, ¶ 18 (App. 2016). In his opening brief, Evan makes no argument, nor does he cite legal authority or the portions of the record on which he relies to establish that the trial court erred. Although Evan is representing himself, he is “entitled to no more consideration than if [he] had been represented by counsel” and he is “held to the same standards as attorneys with respect to ‘familiarity with required procedures and . . . notice of statutes and local rules.’” *In re Marriage of Williams*, 219 Ariz. 546, ¶ 13 (App. 2008) (quoting *Smith v. Rabb*, 95 Ariz. 49, 53 (1963)). Accordingly, in the absence of a properly developed argument, or compliance with the Rules of Civil Appellate Procedure, Evan has waived any issue related to the order of protection. See *Sholes v. Fernando*, 228 Ariz. 455, ¶ 16 (App. 2011).

**Disposition**

¶5           For the foregoing reasons, we affirm.